Procter & Gamble – I.P. Division

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET AND

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

TO: **Mail Stop Petition - United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Fax No. (703) 308-6916 Phone No. (703) 305-9282

FAX RECEIVED
APR 28 2003
PETITIONS OFFICE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 28, 2003, to the above-identified facsimile number.

Teresa A. Wert (Signature)

FROM: **Teresa A. Wert (Office of David K. Mattheis)**

Fax No. 513-634-3612 Phone No. 513-634-3114

Listed below are the item(s) being submitted with this Certificate of Transmission:**

1) Statement of Reason for Delay/Petition Transmittal (Orig. & Copy)

2) Petition For Revival of An Application For Patent Abandoned Unintentionally (2 pgs.)

3) Request For Continued Examination (Orig. & Copy)

4) Copy of August 2, 2001 Interview Summary (2 pgs.)

Comments:

Number of Pages Including this Page: 9

Inventor(s): Dean Van Phan
S.N.: 09/100,624
Filed: June 19, 1998
Case: 7187

**Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, OR this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Box AF, Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on August 2, 2001

David K. Mantheis — P-48,683
Name of Attorney — Reg. Number

Signature

Case 7187

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of	:	
DEAN VAN PHAN	:	
Serial No. 09/100,624	:	Group Art Unit 1771
Filed June 19, 1998	:	Examiner C. Pratt
Confirmation No. 8762	:	
For Apparatus For Making	:	
Structured Paper	:	

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Box AF
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This submission is intended to relate the substance of a telephonic interview with Examiner Pratt held July 9, 2001 regarding the above-referenced application. As per the request of the Examiner, Petitioners herewith submit the arguments presented during the interview for further review by the Examiner and his Supervisor.

Petitioners submit that the present invention relates to a papermaking belt comprised of a structure forming layer and a dewatering felt layer. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-8 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trokhan (5,556,509) in view of Deschamps (FR 394134).

Petitioners submit that the '509 patent teaches dewatering of the paper web by contact between the dewatering felt and the web. Further that the dewatering occurs because the felt layer in contact with the web is a high density felt layer. The second layer of the preferred embodiment of the '509 patent is of a lower density than the first layer. Water that begins to move from the paper web into the first layer - because the first layer has a high density and small pores - will continue to move into the second layer because the second layer has a lower density and less resistance to flow than the first layer.

With respect to the Examiner's argument that a high density woven layer could be substituted for the high density felt layer of the '509 patent, if such a woven layer were functionally equivalent to the high density felt layer. Petitioners submit, however, that a woven layer with pores small enough that the layer would be functionally equivalent to the high density felt layer of the '509 patent, would not be able to satisfy the claim requirement that the layer have a higher air permeability than the second layer of the belt. The air permeability of a layer is related to the size of the pores and the density of the layer. Smaller pores and a higher density reduce air permeability. Thus, a tightly woven layer with small pores equivalent to a high density felt would have a low air permeability.

Petitioners respectfully submit that a woven structure according to Deschamps or according to Trokhan '790, (cited by the Examiner with Trokhan '509 against claims 9, 11-18, and 20-21) cannot simultaneously satisfy the functionality of the high density felt layer of the '509 patent and the requirement of the present invention that the air permeability of such a layer be greater than the air permeability of the second layer of the belt. Accordingly, Petitioners assert that the substitution of a woven structure that is functionally equivalent to the top layer of the '509 patent would not result in the claimed invention. Therefore, Petitioners assert that the substitution of a woven structure according to the claimed invention for the top layer of the '509 patent would not be obvious to one skilled in the art because such a substitution would not function as the belt of the '509 patent.

Accordingly, Petitioners respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-18 and 20-25 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: DEAN VAN PHAN

By _____

David K. Mattheis
Attorney (or Agent) for Applicant(s)
Registration No. P48,683
(513) 634-7419

August 2, 2001
Customer No. 27752

(appnot.doc)
(Last Revised 3/22/01)